

創価大学  
国際仏教学高等研究所  
年 報

平成 21 年度  
(第 13 号)

Annual Report  
of  
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
at Soka University  
for the Academic Year 2009  
Volume XIII

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所  
東京・2010・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
Soka University  
Tokyo・2010

## Re-Evaluating Zhu Fonian's *Shizhu duanjie jing* (T309): Translation or Forgery?\*

Jan NATTIER

### Introduction

One of the most famous names in the history of Chinese Buddhist translations is that of Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 (fl. c. 365-early 400s CE). Among contemporary scholars he is probably best known for his work on the *Dīrghāgama* (*Chang ahan jing* 長阿含經, T1) and the Dharma-guptaka *Vinaya* (*Sifen lü* 四分律, T1428), both of which he is said to have translated in collaboration with a foreign monk, Buddhayaśas 佛陀耶舍. Our earliest source on the life of Zhu Fonian, however—the biographical account contained in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集, produced by the great scholar-monk Sengyou 僧祐—does not mention these scriptures at all.<sup>1</sup> Instead, it focuses on a different set of texts, some of them translated by Zhu Fonian together with foreign monks (Buddhayaśas is not one of those mentioned here) and others produced by Zhu Fonian himself. Among the latter group is a text referred to by Sengyou as the *Shizhu duanjie* 十住斷結, corresponding to a work which now bears the name *Zuisheng wen pusa shizhu chugou duanjie jing* 最勝問菩薩十住除垢斷結經 “The Scripture in which ‘Most Victorious’ Inquires Concerning the Bodhisattva’s Ten Stages, the Removal of Impurities, and the Cutting of the Bonds” (T309).<sup>2</sup> It is this scripture—which has received almost no scholarly attention to date, but which contains precious clues about Zhu Fonian’s method of working—that will be the focus of attention here.

---

\* This paper was originally presented at the annual meeting of the American Oriental Society (Western Branch) held in Victoria, Canada in October 2006. Updated versions were subsequently given at an informal meeting of the Early Chinese Translations group in Hachioji (March 2007), at an international symposium held at Soka University (November 2008), and in a lecture sponsored by the Buddhist Studies program at the University of California, Berkeley (November 2009). I would like to thank the participants in all of these events for their stimulating comments and questions, which led me to refine and expand this paper in several respects. I would also like to thank Stefano Zacchetti and Elsa Legittimo for having sent me copies of the articles by PU Chengzhong (2008) and UNEBE Toshihide (1968), respectively. Finally, I would like to thank Paul Harrison, KANNO Hiroshi 菅野博史, Giuliana Martini, John R. McRae, and Stefano Zacchetti for providing comments and suggestions on earlier drafts. Any errors that remain, of course, are my own.

<sup>1</sup> T2145, 55.111b7-25. The version of his biography given in the the *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 by Huijiao 慧皎 (completed 530 CE; see T2059, 50.329a28-b1) is virtually identical, as is typically the case, for it is well known that Huijiao drew extensively on Sengyou’s work (see Link 1957).

<sup>2</sup> This cumbersome title seems to appear for the first time in the *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄, produced in 730 CE by Zhisheng 智昇 (see T2154, 55.511c27, 686c17, and 709c18). Within the text itself (at least in the printed Taishō edition), the scripture is referred to simply as the *Shizhu duanjie jing* 十住斷結經; I will use this shorter form of the name, which was known already to Sengyou, throughout the discussion here.

Studies of the works of Chinese translators generally begin with the attributions found in traditional scriptural catalogues, and in general—provided such studies begin with the earliest available records, contained in Sengyou's *Chu sanzang ji ji*, examining the contents of later catalogues carefully and critically in this light—this is a reasonable procedure. In the present case, however (and perhaps in others as well), beginning not with the catalogue section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* but with the biographical section of the same work can cast important light on the overall contours of Zhu Fonian's translation career. As Antonello Palumbo has shown, the biographical section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* was completed earlier (probably no later than 503 CE) than the catalogue section of the same text, which continued to be revised until c. 515 CE (Palumbo 2003, p. 197). The chronological priority of the biographical section suggests that it is preferable to read the catalogue entries assigned to a given translator in light of his biography, rather than the reverse. As we shall see, this procedure will have important implications for our understanding of the life and works of Zhu Fonian.

### Zhu Fonian's Career According to the *Chu sanzang ji ji*

According to Sengyou's biography Zhu Fonian was originally from Liangzhou 涼州, where he had left home at an early age to become a monk. His family had lived for generations in Xihe 西河, and as a result he knew the local language[s] well.<sup>3</sup> In typically hyperbolic fashion, Sengyou describes Zhu Fonian's linguistic abilities as follows: "As to both Chinese and non-Chinese (*rong* 戎) languages, there was none that he did not understand" (華戎音義莫不兼解; T2145, 55.111b11).

Zhu Fonian's entrance into the limelight, however, took place during the reign of Fu Jian 苻堅 (r. 357-384, d. 385) of the Former Qin 前秦 dynasty. During Fu Jian's reign two foreign monks, \*Saṃghabhūti 僧伽跋澄 (or \*Saṃghabhadra?)<sup>4</sup> from the region of Jibin 罽賓 (often identified with Kashmir, though in this instance it more likely refers to the region of Gandhāra)<sup>5</sup> and Dharmanandin 曇摩難提 (described as a Tokharian, 兜佉勒), had arrived in

<sup>3</sup> 家世西河洞曉方語 (55.11bb10-11). On controversies concerning this place-name see Okayama 1984, pp. 34-35, n. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Neither of these two "received traditions" on the Indian antecedent of this name is entirely satisfactory. The characters *sengqie* 僧伽 as a transcription of *saṃgha* are unproblematic, but *bacheng* 跋澄 (EMC bat dring; see Pulleyblank 1991, pp. 27 and 54) is difficult to align with any obvious Indian antecedent. The *Gaoseng zhuan* glosses the name as *zhongxian* 眾現 "assembly-manifest" (T2059, 50.328a28), which might point toward an underlying \*Saṃghabhūti (cf. Xuanzang's translation of the name "Subhūti" as *shanxian* 善現, T220, 5.56a29 and *passim*). The suggestion given in the *Hōbōgirin, Fascicule Annexe* (Demiéville et al., 1978, p. 281a, s.v. Sōgyabacchō) that *xian* 現 might be an error for *xian* 賢 (and thus that the name should be reconstructed as \*Saṃghabhadra) is ingenious, but the fact remains that the characters 跋澄 do not correspond well to Sanskrit or Prakrit *bhadra* (or *bhadda*). Moreover, another transcribed name that corresponds unproblematically to Saṃghabhadra is attested in scriptural catalogues from the time of Sengyou (僧伽跋陀羅, e.g., at 55.13b22-23). I have opted to use the form Saṃghabhūti here on the strength of the gloss found in the *Gaoseng zhuan*, but I do not do so with great confidence that it is correct.

<sup>5</sup> See Kuwayama 1990, pp. 43-53 and Enomoto 1994, especially p. 361. It is generally agreed that the referent of the term Jibin 罽賓 shifted over time, which makes it impossible to establish any fixed equivalence with a specific geographical region. According to Kuwayama, prior to the fifth century CE the term was used to refer to Gandhāra, while in the early fifth century it began to be used to designate Kashmir; according to Enomoto, the term had a broader referent already in the fourth to sixth centuries CE, referring to both Kashmir

the capital city of Chang'an 長安, bringing with them previously untranslated Indian texts. A government official, Zhao Zheng 趙政 (the secretary to Fu Jian), asked Saṃghabhūti to recite one of these, but at that time no one was able to translate it into Chinese. According to Sengyou, "Everyone recommended [Zhu Fonian]" (眾咸推念), and accordingly he was invited to join this translation project.<sup>6</sup>

The texts that he translated, as the result of this initial invitation, were the following:

- the "Vasumitra scripture" (*Poxumi jing* 婆須蜜經), an abhidharma text brought by Saṃghabhūti (see T1549, *Zun Posumi pusa suoji lun* 尊婆須蜜菩薩所集論)
- the "Avadāna of the Prince who Destroyed his Eyes for the Sake of the Dharma" (*Wangzi fayi huai mu yinyuan jing* 王子法益壞目因緣經), a text brought by Dharmanandin (see T2045, *Ayu wang xi huai mu yinyuan jing* 阿育王息壤目因緣經)

Both of these were completed successfully, and Zhu Fonian also composed a preface to the latter.<sup>7</sup>

Zhao Zheng then asked Dharmanandin to "bring forth" (出, here meaning "to recite") two large *āgama* collections; here the date of his request is specified as the 20th year of the Jianyuan period 建元二十年, i.e., 384 CE (55.111b18). And once again it was Zhu Fonian who was asked to translate them. The work took two years, resulting in the following translations:

- the *Ekottarikāgama* (see T125, *Zengyi ahan jing* 增壹阿含經),<sup>8</sup> and
- the *Madhyamāgama* (not extant; cf. T26, *Zhong ahan jing* 中阿含經 translated by Gautama Saṃghadeva 瞿曇僧伽提婆)

Sengyou praises these works lavishly, writing that "the brilliant manifestation of the two *āgamas* is due to the power of Zhu Fonian" (二含光顯念之力也, 55.111b20-21).

Thus during the period prior to 387 CE Sengyou describes Zhu Fonian as producing four translations: one abhidharma text, one *avadāna*, and two *āgama* collections. The following years, however, are passed over by Sengyou in silence; in his biography of Zhu Fonian, at any rate, there is no mention of any works produced between 387 and 398 CE.

---

and Gandhāra and possibly Tokharistan as well. In the present context, since Dharmanandin (but not Saṃghabhūti) is referred to as a Tokharian, we may infer that the term Jibin is being used to refer to a region other than Tokharistan.

<sup>6</sup> Sengyou's biographical account does not make it clear whether Zhu Fonian came to Chang'an in response to this invitation or was already living in the capital. The statement that he arrived in Chang'an in 365 CE, which is found in some standard reference works (see for example Demiéville et al. 1978, p. 258), is not supported by Sengyou, who states simply that Zhu Fonian arrived during the reign of Fu Jian (i.e., during the period from 357-384 CE). A comprehensive re-evaluation of all of the chronological information concerning Zhu Fonian's work contained in early scriptural catalogues, prefaces, and biographies of his collaborators lies beyond the range of the present paper, though such a study might yield valuable results.

<sup>7</sup> For the preface itself see the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, T2145, 55.51b14-c16.

<sup>8</sup> T125 is attributed to Gautama Saṃghadeva by the Taishō editors, but the language is not at all the same as his other major translation (T26, the *Madhyamāgama*; for some specific examples see Nattier 2007a, pp. 195-196, n. 48), while on the contrary it harmonizes well with terminology used elsewhere by Zhu Fonian. As the result of my own studies of the terminology of T125, I am in agreement with the conclusion of Elsa Legittimo that the Chinese *Ekottarikāgama* as we have it is either Zhu Fonian's original work or a slightly revised version of it (see Legittimo 2006, pp. 80-81).

The impression given here, in other words, is that there was a gap in Zhu Fonian's output during this period.

From the beginning of the Hongshi 弘始 period (399–415) during the reign of Yao Xing 姚興 of the Latter Qin 後秦, however, Sengyou again mentions translations being produced by Zhu Fonian. At this time, he reports, “scriptural studies were flourishing” (經學甚盛), and Zhu Fonian produced a variety of texts “one after the other” (續出). In contrast to the first period of his translation activity, when Zhu Fonian worked closely with at least two foreign monks, no mention is made of any collaboration with others here. We may infer, therefore, that Zhu Fonian was now working alone.<sup>9</sup> Be that as it may, during this period he produced the following texts (using the titles given by Sengyou and listing them in the sequence in which they occur in his work):

- *Pusa yingluo* 菩薩瓔珞 (= T656, 菩薩瓔珞經)
- *Shizhu duanjie* 十住斷結 (= T309, 最勝問菩薩十住除垢斷結經; internal title: 十住斷結經)
- *Chuyao* 出曜 (= T212, 出曜經)<sup>10</sup>
- *Tai jing* 胎經 (= T384, 菩薩從兜術天降神母胎說廣普經; internal title: 菩薩處胎經)<sup>11</sup>
- *Zhongyin jing* 中陰經 (= T385, 中陰經)<sup>12</sup>

All of the above works are extant today, and they can be found in the Taishō canon under the numbers listed above. With just one exception—the *Chuyao jing* 出曜經 (T212), a version of the *Dharmapada* containing additional narrative and commentarial material—all of the above texts are Mahāyāna scriptures, describing and recommending the bodhisattva path. This is in sharp contrast to his earlier period of translation activity, when he produced only non-Mahāyāna works.<sup>13</sup>

After providing this list Sengyou again praises Zhu Fonian, stating that during the Fu 苻 and Yao 姚 periods (i.e., the Former and Latter Qin) he was the senior figure among translators (為譯人之宗, 55.111b23). Not only that, Sengyou also claims that “After the

<sup>9</sup> This impression is reinforced in the version of the biography preserved in the *Gaoseng zhuan*, which reads (in several editions) 續自出 (T2059, 50.329b, n. 16; see Shih 1968, p. 56, n. 219). Strangely, the *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目錄, compiled by Fajing 法經 et al. in 594 CE, i.e., some eighty years after Sengyou's time, states that Zhu Fonian translated the *Shizhu duanjie jing* together with Daoan (竺佛念共道安譯), and that the work was produced during the Former rather than the Latter Qin period (前秦建元年; see T2146, 55.115a19). (Here the word 年 is clearly being used to refer to an entire era rather than a specific year; I would like to thank Stefano Zacchetti for clarifying this point [personal communication, 16 February 2010].) This is clearly in conflict with what is said in Sengyou's biography of Zhu Fonian, where the text is assigned to the Latter Qin period and no mention is made of any collaborator. In addition the reference to Daoan as a co-translator found in the *Zhongjing mulu* is unexpected, for although Daoan is known to have made important observations concerning the translation process and to have coordinated various translation activities, he is not said to have been fluent in any foreign language or to have worked as a translator himself. Further work on this passage (and on its parallels in other scriptural catalogues) would be welcome.

<sup>10</sup> This text has been the subject of a number of studies, most recently by HIRAOKA Satoshi (2007a).

<sup>11</sup> This text is the subject of a dissertation recently completed by Elsa Legittimo (2006).

<sup>12</sup> A study and translation of this text is currently being prepared by Mark Blum.

<sup>13</sup> It is well known, however, that the *Ekottarikāgama* (T125) contains a number of Mahāyāna elements, an issue to which we will return below.

time of An Shigao and Zhi Qian, there was no one who surpassed Zhu Fonian” (自世高支謙以後莫踰於念, 111b23-24).<sup>14</sup> Such hyperbole is standard in traditional Chinese Buddhist biographies, but Sengyou’s comment is particularly striking when we recall that Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什 had arrived in Chang’an in 401 CE and was active at precisely this same time.

No other works produced by Zhu Fonian are mentioned in the biography contained in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, and the version preserved in the *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 gives the same list of texts (cf. n. 1 above). Several additional translations, however, are attributed to Zhu Fonian in the catalogue section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, including the above-mentioned *Dīrghāgama* and Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya* as well as a version of the smaller *Prajñāpāramitā* (摩訶鉢羅若波羅蜜經抄, = T226?). There are some contradictions between the chronological information found in Zhu Fonian’s biography and what is given in the catalogue section of Sengyou’s text, and in future studies it will be important to examine these problems in detail.<sup>15</sup> For the purpose at hand, however, it is sufficient to note that in the biography itself, Zhu Fonian’s translation career is portrayed as consisting of two distinct phases: an early period (during the Former Qin) when he translated non-Mahāyāna scriptures recited by foreign monks, and a later period (during the Latter Qin) when he produced a number of Mahāyāna scriptures, as well as an expanded version of the *Dharmapada*, while apparently working by himself.

### The *Shizhu duanjie jing* 十住斷結經: An Overview

With the above background in mind, we may now turn to the *Shizhu duanjie jing* (“Scripture on the Ten Stages and the Cutting of the Bonds,” T309), which is one of the texts assigned by Sengyou to the latter part of Zhu Fonian’s translation career. So far as I have been able to determine, this text has received almost no attention from modern scholars. Its basic theme—the ten stages of the bodhisattva path—is quite familiar, but its description of the stages does not correspond to that of any other Buddhist text, and no other version of this scripture has been identified in any language, whether in Sanskrit (or Prakrit), in Tibetan, or in another Chinese translation. Indeed, it should be emphasized that this is a feature which the *Shizhu duanjie jing* shares with all of the texts by Zhu Fonian assigned by Sengyou to this latter period: it is a “sole exemplar,” with no parallel in any other language.<sup>16</sup>

Like many other works produced by Zhu Fonian, the *Shizhu duanjie jing* is extremely long, comprising over eighty pages in the printed Taishō edition (10.966a-1047b). Because of its length, it is not feasible to give a detailed description of the entire scripture here. Instead, in the following discussion I will focus on certain passages which are particularly useful in casting light on Zhu Fonian’s *modus operandi*.

Before turning our attention to these specific examples it may be useful to provide a brief overview of the content of the text as a whole. In very general terms, it may be

<sup>14</sup> T2145, 55.111b23-24.

<sup>15</sup> For a brief discussion of these chronological discrepancies see below, pp. 255-256.

<sup>16</sup> This statement also applies to the *Chuyao jing* (T212) which, as mentioned above, contains not only a version of the *Dharmapada* (which of course is attested in numerous sources in a variety of languages) but also substantial additional narrative and commentarial material.

described as consisting of the following three sections:

- (1) An introduction (*nidāna*), relating the place where the discourse was delivered and the identity of the members of the audience (10.966a9-c24);
- (2) A description by the Buddha of the ten stages of the bodhisattva path, given in response to a question from the bodhisattva “Most Victorious” (最勝), who is present in the assembly (966c25-1036b7); and
- (3) A discussion of various other aspects of the Mahāyāna (the six *pāramitās*, the idea of the three vehicles, and so on), given in response to questions from various bodhisattvas. Much of this discourse is actually pronounced not by the Buddha, but by the bodhisattva “Soft Head” (濡首, perhaps better “Foremost of the Gentle”), an unusual translation of the name of Mañjuśrī that had first appeared in a translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* produced by Zhi Qian in the early third century C.E. (1036b8-1047b12).<sup>17</sup>

To characterize the *nidāna* in brief, the Buddha is said to be at Vaiśālī (毘舍離), in the grove of Āmrapālī (奈氏樹園),<sup>18</sup> together with 84,000 bhikṣus and 104,000 bodhisattvas. Emitting a ray of light from his tongue, the Buddha illuminates the three thousand great-thousand [*buddha*]-*kṣetras* (sic; 復以舌相光明普照三千大千剎土). One of these is a land located 92,000 buddha-fields to the East of our own world, named Flourishing Wonder (盛妙), whose presiding Buddha is named Distinguished Victory (殊勝). Perceiving the light emitted by Śākyamuni, the leading bodhisattva of that world, whose name is Controlled Intention (執志), requests permission to visit his Sahā world. The Buddha Distinguished Victory gives his consent, but tells Controlled Intention that, if he goes to the Sahā world, he should undertake a set of fifty-five practices (雖至忍界即當奉行五十五事).<sup>19</sup> A list consisting of far fewer than fifty-five items is then given, but what it lacks in length it makes up in impact, for Controlled Intention is told that he should view such pairs of opposites as observing the precepts and violating the precepts, disordered thoughts and *dhyāna*, or one’s enemies and one’s parents, as being not different from one another. Distinguished Victory then adds that upholding *brahmacarya* in his own world for hundreds of thousands of kalpas cannot equal being able to be without pride for just an instant in the Sahā world. Controlled Intention then sets out for Śākyamuni’s realm, accompanied by another fifty thousand bodhisattvas, and they all arrive there instantaneously.

Seeing these bodhisattvas arrive from their distant buddha-field, Śākyamuni extols the virtues of their leader, Controlled Intention, to the assembled crowd. Meanwhile, a member of Śākyamuni’s own congregation, the bodhisattva “Most Victorious” 最勝, asks the Buddha to describe the practice of the bodhisattva. In response, Śākyamuni embarks upon a long discourse on the stages of the bodhisattva path.

<sup>17</sup> See the *Weimojie jing* 維摩詰經 (T474), 14.519b18 and 525b18. As a translation of *mañju* “sweet, soft” the character 濡 should presumably be understood not as “moist, glossy” but rather as “soft, gentle.” I would like to thank Paul Harrison for bringing this possibility to my attention (e-mail of 16 February 2010).

<sup>18</sup> The printed Taishō edition gives the non-standard reading 櫟 for the first character.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Dharmarakṣa’s *Xiuxing daodi jing* 修行道地經, where fifty-five items are also mentioned but are actually listed individually (T606, 15.219a20ff.). For a summary of these items see Demiéville 1954, p. 419 (I would like to thank Stefano Zacchetti for bringing this discussion to my attention).

### Anomalies in the *Shizhu duanjie jing*: Preliminary Remarks

The material outlined above would seem, at first glance, to be entirely at home in a Mahāyāna sūtra. Even some of its more unusual features—the theme of bodhisattvas traveling from another world-system to join Śākyamuni’s congregation, for example, or the idea of viewing opposites such as violating the precepts vs. observing the precepts as the same—have counterparts in other Mahāyāna scriptures, e.g., in the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, which had already been translated into Chinese more than a century before Zhu Fonian’s time.<sup>20</sup> At first glance, therefore, there is nothing to suggest that this is anything other than an ordinary Chinese translation of one of the thousands of Mahāyāna sūtras that circulated in India during the early centuries of the Common Era.

Certain unexpected turns of phrase, however, do catch one’s eye. At the beginning of the discussion of the ten stages, for example, when the bodhisattva Most Victorious asks about the bodhisattva’s practices from the first through the tenth stage, he phrases the question in terms of what the bodhisattva does “from the time he first takes steps until he becomes a Buddha” (從初發跡至成作佛, 10.966c25-26). Here the phrase “first takes steps” (初發跡) is unexpected; in this context it would be more normal to find a phrase like “first brings forth the thought [of awakening]” (初發意 or 初發心). Indeed this phrasing is unusual for Zhu Fonian himself, for it appears only in this text (in the passage cited above and again at 1003a29). We might also wonder what could be the Indian equivalent of another statement using the character *ji* 跡 (found somewhat later in this section), where it is said that the bodhisattva should abandon “that which has tracks and that which does not have tracks” (當除有跡無跡, again an unusual phrase for Zhu Fonian, with 有跡無跡 appearing only in this text, where it occurs two times at 967b5). Nor do we usually see the Buddha replying to questioners with a statement in the form *fei ye* 非也 “No, it isn’t” (e.g., at 967a20-21). Indeed, the expression 非也 is extremely unusual in translated sūtras, though it can be found in a few works produced before Zhu Fonian’s time, notably in the *Fang guang banruo jing* 放光般若經 (T221) translated by Wuluocha 無羅叉 (\*Mokṣala) toward the end of the third century CE, as well as in several other works by Zhu Fonian himself.<sup>21</sup> I have not been able to locate any other text, however, in which 非也 is used to translate a statement made by the Buddha himself.

When we come to the discussion of the second stage of the bodhisattva path we find an expression which, while well attested in a number of translations produced prior to Zhu Fonian’s time, is unusual in his own work. The use of *liu shuai* 六衰 “six ruinners” as a translation of the six *āyatana*s occurs widely in early translations, appearing with special frequency in the works of Dharmarakṣa (Zhu Fahu 竺法護, fl. 265-309 CE) and in Mokṣala’s *Fang guang jing* 放光經 (T221). In Zhu Fonian’s corpus, however, the expression 六入 “six

<sup>20</sup> For the motif of bodhisattvas traveling from another buddha-field to Śākyamuni’s Saḥa realm see chapter ix, §8 (Taishō University Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, 2004, pp. 368-369). Parallels between the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* and another text produced by Zhu Fonian are discussed in Legittimo 2007.

<sup>21</sup> In Mokṣala’s translation (T221) the expression 非也 occurs twelve times, at 12a-b, 17b, and 33c. For occurrences of this expression in Zhu Fonian’s work see T125(14x), T384(29x), and T656(17x). In T309 itself 非也 occurs eighteen times, of which several (e.g., 967a20-21 and 22, 1021a5-6, and 1041a19 and 21) are presented as the words of the Buddha.



entrances” is overwhelmingly preferred.<sup>22</sup>

### Terminological Anomalies: Methodological Issues

The fact that the expression *liu shuai* 六衰, which is atypical of Zhu Fonian's work, occurs in the *Shizhu duanjie jing* offers interesting possibilities for interpretation, for there are a number of ways in which such a situation can come about. First, it may be that the anomalous term in question was not actually used by the translator at all, but instead was introduced through subsequent scribal emendation. This is especially likely to be the case when the translator's own preferred term became obsolete after his time, while the atypical term found in his text subsequently became standard. The sole occurrence of *ying gong* 應供 “worthy of offerings” in Zhi Qian's corpus (T76, 1.883c11) is surely such a case, resulting from an unknown scribe's “correction” of Zhi Qian's own translation of the term *arhat* as *ying yi* 應儀 “worthy of esteem.”<sup>23</sup> In the case of 六衰, however, the reverse is the case, for it was not 六衰 but 六入 that became standard after Zhu Fonian's time. It seems quite unlikely, therefore, that a scribe would have changed 六入 to 六衰 in the course of copying Zhu Fonian's work. Thus this first scenario does not provide a plausible explanation for what we see in the *Shizhu duanjie jing*.

A second possibility is that the text in which such an atypical term appears is not a wholly original translation, but is a revision of a pre-existing work. In this case the translator (even if he was using a new Indic-language manuscript) might simply take over certain expressions used by his predecessor, even though he did not ordinarily use these expressions himself. Thus in the *Wuliang qingjing pingdengjue jing* 無量清淨平等覺經 (T361), for example, Zhi Qian follows the earlier version of the text produced by Lokakṣema or a member of his school in using the transcription *Elouxuan* 廬樓亘 for a Prakrit form of the name of Avalokiteśvara, a rendition that does not appear anywhere else in his work.<sup>24</sup> In the case of the *Shizhu duanjie jing*, however, we have no evidence that any other version of the text ever existed, and thus there are no grounds to assume that Zhu Fonian's work was a revision of an earlier translation of the same text.

A third possibility is that the text in question was produced during a period in which the translator was strongly influenced by the work of one or more of his predecessors, and thus preferentially adopted terminology that had appeared in these texts. To draw an example

<sup>22</sup> Aside from the sixteen occurrences found here in T309, 六衰 occurs in Zhu Fonian's work only in T656(3x) and in T226, if indeed this text is his (2x). For the term *shuai* 衰 as a translation of *āyatana* see Vetter and Harrison 1998, p. 211 and Zacchetti 2005, p. 352, n. 138. The term 六入 appears in all of the texts assigned by Sengyou to Zhu Fonian's “second translation period,” viz. T212(5x), T384(8x), T385(2x), and T656(10x), as well as T309 itself (11x). It also appears in most of his other works, with the exception only of T2045 (which, as scripture belonging to the *avadāna* genre, would not be expected to refer to the *āyatanas* at all).

<sup>23</sup> On these terms see Nattier 2003, pp. 215-217.

<sup>24</sup> On this name see Karashima 1999, p. 40 and n. 2, and Nattier 2007b, pp. 189-192. The name occurs five times in Zhi Qian's translation (T361, 12.288b19 and 24, 290a22 and 27, and 291a4). In the Taishō edition of the canon (and thus in the digital version produced by CBETA) the character 廬 is printed as *gai* 蓋 in Lokakṣema's version of the text (T362, 12.308b15-16 and 21, 309a15). On the attribution of T361 and T362 to Zhi Qian and Lokakṣema respectively see Nattier 2008, pp. 139 and 86-87, with further reference to work by Paul Harrison on this topic (Harrison 1998, pp. 556-557 and notes 16-18, Harrison 1999, and Harrison et al. 2002).

from Zhi Qian's work yet again, it is clear that his translation of the *Da mingdu jing* (T225B, comprising chapters 2-30 of the scripture as we have it) was produced with an eye toward the terminology and style of the *Fa jing jing* 法鏡經 (T322, *Ugrapariprocchā*) produced in the late second century CE by An Xuan 安玄 and Yan Fotiao 嚴佛調. While the two sūtras are quite different in content, Zhi Qian has drawn a number of unusual terms (e.g., *kaishi* 闍士 [var. 開士] for *bodhisattva* and *chu jin* 除鐘 for *bhikṣu*) from An Xuan and Yan Fotiao's work. As I have suggested elsewhere, Zhi Qian's *Da mingdu jing* appears to have been produced during a period when he was quite entranced by the *Fa jing jing*, which yielded a result quite different from the works he produced at other points in his career.<sup>25</sup>

As we shall see, in the case of the *Shizhu duanjie jing* it is an unusual version of this third scenario, together with a variation on the second, that can account for the oddities that we see in Zhu Fonian's work.

#### Sources of the *Shizhu duanjie jing* (1): Mokṣala's *Fang guang banruo jing* 放光般若經 (T221)

By Zhu Fonian's time a substantial amount of Buddhist literature was in circulation in Chinese, and there were literally hundreds of scriptures that he might have consulted in the course of producing his own work. Above, however, we have noted several cases in which expressions found in Zhu Fonian's *Shizhu duanjie jing* have precedents in Mokṣala's *Fang guang jing* (T221). Bearing this in mind, if we look for occurrences of the expression 六衰 in Mokṣala's translation, we come upon a passage that bears a striking resemblance to the wording found in Zhu Fonian's text. The narrative contexts in which these two passages occur are entirely different: in Mokṣala's *Fang guang jing* the topic under discussion is a list of twenty virtues that come from reciting the forty-two letters of the *arapacana* syllabary, while in Zhu Fonian's *Shizhu duanjie jing* the passage in question deals with practices appropriate to the second stage of the bodhisattva path. But the parallelism between the two texts is striking, and it is so close that it is worth citing these sentences in full. Indicating portions that agree exactly with a solid underline, and portions that are identical in meaning but different in wording with a dotted underline, they are the following:

T221: 十二者曉了五陰、六衰。十三者善於四諦、十二緣起事。(8.27a5-6)

Twelfth, one fully comprehends the five skandhas (五陰) and the six *āyatana*s (六衰). Thirteenth, one is good at [understanding?] the four truths and the twelve elements of causal arising (十二緣起事).

T309: 曉知五陰六衰所起。復以苦、習、盡、道分別十二緣起。(10.968b9-10)

[The bodhisattva should] thoroughly know the five skandhas (五陰) and the six *āyatana*s (六衰) that arise, and by means of [the truths of] suffering, the coming together [of suffering], the extinction [of suffering], and the path, he distinguishes among the twelve [elements of] causal arising (十二緣起).

<sup>25</sup> See Nattier 2008 (2009).

At first glance these correspondences might seem to be a mere coincidence; after all, we have to do here with a list of standard Buddhist categories, and these items occur in many other scriptural texts. But the correspondences given above are especially close, and if we look at the broader contexts in which they occur in the texts produced by Mokṣala and Zhu Fonian, respectively, we find that the similarities extend well beyond the lines cited above. Comparing the entire list of twenty items given in Mokṣala's text (that is, twenty virtues that come from reciting the *arapacana* syllabary) with the corresponding passage from Zhu Fonian's text (describing the second bodhisattva stage), we obtain the following parallels:

Mokṣala's <i>Fang guang banruo jing</i> (T221)	Zhu Fonian's <i>Shizhu duanjie jing</i> (T309)
若有菩薩摩訶薩聞是四十二字所入句印者，持誦誦者，若復為他人解說其義，不以望見持誦誦者，當得二十功德。何等為二十？(8.26c25-28)	---
---	其慧純淑無所罣礙。心之所規無所不容。大慈無窮不盡之藏。(10.968b2-4)
一者得 <u>強識</u> 念力。二者得 <u>慚愧羞恥</u> 力。(28-29)	得 <u>識辯</u> 才常懷 <u>羞恥</u> 。(4)
三者得 <u>堅固</u> 行力。四者得 <u>覺知</u> 力。(26c29-27a1)	<u>堅固</u> 之 <u>行</u> 心不可沮。 <u>覺道</u> 之 <u>力</u> 無所不入。(4-5)
五者得 <u>辯才</u> 工談語力。六者得 <u>陀鄰尼</u> 不難力。(1-2)	<u>辯才</u> 過眾無不渴仰。 <u>得</u> 諸總持亦不 <u>忘失</u> 。(5-6)
七者所語不說不急之事。八者終不狐疑於經。(2-3)	初不演說不急之事。於百千定終不狐疑。(6-7)
九者聞善不喜聞惡不憂。十者亦不自貢高。亦不自卑。(3-4)	聞善惡法不懷憂喜。不自貢高復不自下。(7-8)
十一者進止安詳不失威儀。十二者曉了五陰、六衰。(4-5)	進趣安詳不失威儀。十二行本。曉知五陰、六衰所起。(8-9)
十三者善於四諦十二緣起事。十四者善知識因緣事。(5-7)	復以 <u>煮...習...肅...道</u> 分別十二緣起。癡行生死靡不貫達。(9-10)
十五者善於法慧能滿具諸根。(7)	觀察五根具滿思念。不復往來生死穢著。(10-11)
十六者知他人所念吉凶報應。十七者善於天耳徹聽自識宿命。十八者善知眾生所生。(7-9)	---
十九者能消諸漏。二十者善於往來處處教授。(9-10)	乃以八十四智消滅諸漏。誓留化身一劫教授。(11-12)
須菩提！是為陀鄰尼門。是為字門。是為來入門。是為菩薩摩訶薩。是為摩訶衍(10-12)	---
---	如我今身必當入於無餘泥洹。不永滅度亦復留化。在賢明土將無數眾。前後圍繞說微妙法。(13-15)

In some cases, as we have already seen above, Zhu Fonian uses terminology that is different from but synonymous with that of Mokṣala (e.g., 總持 for *dhāraṇī* where Mokṣala has 陀鄰尼). In other cases the characters are identical or nearly so, but they appear in a different order (e.g., 聞善惡法不懷憂喜 at 10.968b7-8 in Zhu Fonian's text, where Mokṣala has 聞善不喜聞惡不憂 at 8.27a3). One noticeable difference between Zhu Fonian's work and that of Mokṣala is that Zhu Fonian uses a regular four-character prosodic style throughout, while Mokṣala's translation (though it occasionally exhibits four-character units, as in the passage just cited) is generally framed in non-metric prose.

The oddest correspondence between these two texts is a case where both scriptures contain the number twelve, but Mokṣala's text refers to "the twelfth item" in his list of twenty virtues (十二者, 8.27a5), while Zhu Fonian uses the same number but in a completely different sense (十二行本, which might be translated as "the twelve roots of activation," 10.968b9). This is the most extreme example of identical characters being used in completely different contexts in these two texts.

How, then, can we explain this strange pattern of parallels? First, these are clearly not two different translations of the same scripture, for their contents are completely different. And, as we have seen, even in the specific passages cited above the two texts are dealing with entirely different matters (the benefits of reciting the *arapacana* syllabary vs. the second stage of the bodhisattva path). Second, this is not a case of ordinary (that is, word-for-word) plagiarism, for Zhu Fonian has not simply copied the passage from Mokṣala's work as it stands. Instead, Mokṣala's words are "woven in" to Zhu Fonian's work, with Zhu Fonian adopting—but at the same time adapting—material found in Mokṣala's translation. The obvious corollary is that this passage is not a translation at all, but a creative composition by Zhu Fonian himself, relying on (but not constrained by) the wording of Mokṣala's earlier work.

#### Sources of the *Shizhu duanjie jing* (2): The *Chengju guangming dingyi jing* 成具光明定意經 attributed to Zhi Yao 支曜 (T630)

If the correspondence between Mokṣala's *Fang guang jing* and Zhu Fonian's *Shizhu duanjie jing* were an isolated occurrence, we might dismiss it as a fluke, a strange case of Zhu Fonian having "remembered" a passage from Mokṣala's work (which he might, as a student monk, have actually memorized) and being distracted by it while preparing his own translated text. This is not the only case, however, in which the *Shizhu duanjie jing* echoes the wording of another text. On the contrary, it is only one instance in a pervasive pattern of correspondences between Zhu Fonian's work and scriptures previously translated into Chinese.

One of these is a text whose status as a translation is itself rather unclear, though a work by this title is assigned by Sengyou to a Han-period figure named Zhi Yao (T2145, 55.6c1-2 and 96a6-7). Elsewhere I have discussed some features of the text that lead me to doubt its identity as a genuine Han-period translation.<sup>26</sup> Whatever its status, however, it is clear that it

<sup>26</sup> See Nattier 2008, pp. 96-102. In a recent paper Pu Chengzhong has argued that the *Chengju guangming jing* is not an apocryphon, but a genuine Han-period translation (Pu 2008). Pu is certainly correct in his claim that traditional catalogues, beginning with that of Daoan, assign a work by this title to a Han-period

was in circulation prior to Zhu Fonian's time, for it is cited in the *Fengfa yao* 奉法要 composed by Xi Chao 郗超, which dates from c. 377 CE, just before the beginning of Zhu Fonian's translation activity.<sup>27</sup>

Only a few lines after the parallel to Mokṣala's translation discussed above, we come to a list of items in Zhu Fonian's work that contains most of the elements of the standard list of thirty-seven factors of awakening (*bodhipakṣa-dharmas*). These items are well attested in a wide range of early Chinese Buddhist scriptures, appearing already in the work of An Shigao.<sup>28</sup> The form of this list in the *Shizhu duanjie jing*, however, is peculiar, for it adds two extra categories that are unexpected in this context: something called the "four kinds of

---

figure named Zhi Yao; he is also on solid ground in marshalling evidence that a text matching T630 in length was known and memorized by Daoan, and that a text corresponding to T630 in content was cited by Xi Chao in the latter half of the fourth century CE (pp. 28-33). He is less successful, however, in dealing with other aspects of the terminology and content of the text. In particular, he attempts to refute two possible objections to the text's identity as a genuine translation: first, the fact that its explanation of the practice of the fifth *pāramitā*, i.e., *dhyāna*, proceeds largely on the basis of worldly social relations, something that is difficult to imagine in an Indian context; and second, the fact that it implies that the city of Kapilavastu is in an area referred to as *nan tianzhu* 南天竺 "southern India," which suggests that the author of the text did not know where Kapilavastu was.

As to the first, Pu argues that because the text is designed for a lay audience, it is perfectly valid to explain the practice of *dhyāna* not primarily in terms of meditation but rather as the single-minded engagement in various activities, including filial behavior toward one's parents and other senior figures. This is rather dubious in itself; Pu does not cite any example of another Indian scripture in which *dhyāna*, regardless of the intended audience, is explained in this way. A more significant problem with his discussion, however, is that he fails to note that the entire exegesis in T630 of the practice of *dhyāna* (here translated as *yixin* 一心 "single-mindedness," one of a number of well-established translations of the fifth *pāramitā* in early Chinese texts) proceeds on the basis of the Chinese characters alone. That is, throughout the discussion the term is treated as consisting of *yi* 一 (understood as a verb meaning "to unify") and *xin* 心 "mind," yielding a set of explanations that could not conceivably have been penned by an Indian author.

Pu misrepresents my own discussion of this passage in an earlier publication (Nattier 2003, p. 233, n. 102), incidentally, when he says that I suspect T630 of being an apocryphon because it discusses filial piety (Pu 2008, p. 40). No one who has read the work of Gregory Schopen on this topic (Schopen 1984) would make such a claim, and that certainly was not my point there. On the contrary, what I actually said was not that it is the presence of filial piety, but rather the exegesis of the word *dhyāna* in terms of worldly social relations—which is impossible to connect with any known Indian understanding of the term—that points to the likelihood that this portion of the text, at least, was composed not in India but in China.

As to the second possible objection to the sūtra's authenticity, Pu attempts to show that *nan tianzhu* "southern India" could be an alternative translation of *Jambudvīpa* (the southern continent in Indian cosmology), a term which includes the whole of India and thus by implication the city of Kapilavastu as well (p. 44-45). This attempt, however, is not supported by any examples of such an equivalence in other Chinese translations, and thus in my view it remains unsupported by any concrete evidence.

T630 contains a number of other strange features not discussed by Pu; there is not room to discuss them here, so for the moment readers are referred to my more detailed but still preliminary comments on this topic (Nattier 2008, pp. 96-102). A thorough study of the content of T630 still remains to be done, and further work on this topic will be most welcome.

<sup>27</sup> See T2102, 52.87c25ff. and 88a12ff.

<sup>28</sup> See for example the *Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經 (T603, 15.173c25-26), where the list is translated as follows, with the corresponding Sanskrit terms given for convenience of reference (though An Shigao was surely working from a Prakrit text): 四意止 (four *smṛtyupasthānas*), 四意斷 (four *samyakprahānas*), 四神足 (four *rddhipādas*), 五根 (five *indriyas*), 五力 (five *bālas*), 七覺意 (seven *bodhyāṅgas*), and 賢者八種道術 (*āryaṣṭāṅgamārga*). These items are then explicitly referred to as comprising the thirty-seven *bodhipakṣa-dharmas* (是為三十七品經法, 173c26). In a ground-breaking study Stefano Zacchetti has identified a parallel to this text in the Pāli *Peṭakopadesa* (see Zacchetti 2002).

faith” (四信) placed at the very beginning, and another called the “eight remembrances of the great man” (八大人念) at the end.<sup>29</sup> It also omits one of the standard categories, the four *rddhipadas*.

Such a list is unattested, to the best of my knowledge, in Indian Buddhist texts, but it has an exact parallel in the *Chengju guangming dingyi jing* (T630; henceforth abbreviated as *Chengju guangming jing*). Setting the two texts side by side, we see the following correspondences:

T630: 立四信。住四止。就四斷。插五根。習五力。曉七智。履八正。入八念。  
(15.454a1-2)

He establishes the four kinds of faith; he dwells in the four “stoppings” (*smṛtyupasthāna*), he fully accomplishes the four types of “cutting off” (*samyakprahāṇa*), he penetrates the five roots (*indriya*), he cultivates the five powers (*bāla*), he comprehends the seven kinds of wisdom (*bodhyaṅga*), he traverses the eight correct [ways of action] (*āryamārga*), and he enters into the eight kinds of remembrance.

T309: 堅立四信。住四意止。成四意斷。稱說五根。布現五力無缺減志。曉知七覺諸寶之藏。修行八正賢聖之道。八大人念初不廢捨。(10.968c26-29)

He firmly establishes the four kinds of faith; he dwells in the four stoppings of the mind (*smṛtyupasthāna*), he accomplishes the four kinds of cutting off of the mind (*samyakprahāṇa*), he expounds upon the five roots (*indriya*), he manifests the five powers (*bāla*) with inexhaustible will, he thoroughly knows the treasury of jewels of the seven types of awakening (*bodhyaṅga*), he practices the eight correct [actions] of the way of the sages (*āryamārga*). And as to the eight remembrances of the great man, he never abandons them.

In both cases “four kinds of faith” have been added at the beginning and “eight remembrances” (expanded by Zhu Fonian to read “eight remembrances of the great man”) at the end. Likewise, in both cases the four *rddhipadas* have been omitted. The resulting list is not only non-standard in content, but it also fails to conform to the expected total number of items, for it contains eight sets of items rather than seven, resulting in a total of forty-one (rather than thirty-seven).<sup>30</sup> Such a close match, in such anomalous features, is striking, and a thorough search of the Chinese Buddhist canon has revealed no other instance of a corresponding list. The unusually close correspondence between T630 and T309—not only in content, but also in wording—makes it absolutely clear that the one of these texts has borrowed from the other. Given their relative chronology (with the *Chengju guangming jing* known to have been in circulation prior to Zhu Fonian’s time), it is evident that Zhu Fonian has drawn upon the *Chengju guangming jing*, and not the reverse.

<sup>29</sup> For the “eight remembrances of the great man” (Skt. *mahāpuruṣa-vitarka*) see Mochizuki Bukkyō daijiten vol. 5, pp. 4217c-4218a s.v. ハチダイニンガク 八大人覺 and cf. Harrison 1990, p. 28, §2G. (I would like to thank Paul Harrison for calling my attention to these references). The *locus classicus* for this list appears to be a sūtra variously classified as belonging to the *Anguttara Nikāya*/*Ekottarikāgama* (AN iv.228-235; T125[41.6]) or the *Madhyamāgama* (T26[74] and T46).

<sup>30</sup> It is true that neither T630 nor T309 explicitly refers to this list as comprising the *bodhipakṣadharmas*, but the fact that it is based on the *bodhipakṣa* categories (with the changes noted above) is undeniable.

As before, the correspondence is not limited to these lines alone, but continues through a substantial portion of this section. Comparing these parallels in their entirety, we obtain the following:

Zhi Yao's <i>Chengju guangming jing</i> (T630)	Zhu Fonian's <i>Shizhu duanjie jing</i> (T309)
---	是時世尊復告最勝。二地菩薩達知本無。(968c18-20)
遠身行，離口過，除意念，盡三穢，卻六患，遏五蔽，十二因緣已捐盡。(453c25-26)	遠離身行，去口殃過，除意亂念，消滅三穢，抑制三災，闡塞五弊，推尋十二癡行之本。(20-22)
解結束明六十二沈吟行。(26-27)	---
---	上下五結散在三界。以漸除卻無令增多。(22-23)
愈眾瘡，悅眾惱，捨諸大，棄骨血。(27)	思惟十一苦惱之瘡，捨諸四大，(23)
---	耽著之病，分別諸物惡露之法。(23-24)
避親屬，絕諸習，斷於愛，無諸可，無不可，剗貪垢，刈欲根，不惑流。(27-29)	當避家業，息諸習俗，斷其愛欲、瞋恚、貪垢。淨刈根本，不使流馳。(24-25)
能制疾，不我計，無不我。(29-454a1)	常念思惟。計無我想。(25-26)
立四信，住四止，就四斷，插五根，習五力，曉七智，履八正，入八念。八常勤為已無。(1-2)	堅立四信，住四意止，成四意斷，稱說五根，布現五力無缺減志，曉知七覺諸寶之藏，修行八正賢聖之道，八大人念初不廢捨。(26-29)
----	如是最勝。二地菩薩執心調意。不若干念解知悉空而無真實。乃得上位受菩薩記。(c29-969a2)
勤可行，離不可行，學上智，自尊意，不貢高而濡軟。(2-4)	不動勞行亦不離行。學於上智，雖有尊貴，意不貢高。(2-3)
雨法雨。如一法不兩計，不三想。(4)	觀知諸法一法不二，不計三想。(2-3)
不為無益想。無有際想。不空想，不想想，想無處，不住無處想。(4-6)	亦復不興無益之想。不有限際有無之想。了想無處，不住無處。(3-5)
善惟佛，知佛淨。已知淨而善學。心正住，不邪還，等善惡如明冥。(6-7)	惟正覺淨諸佛亦淨。善御於心正住不邪。等一善惡(5-6)
於明冥知俱空。不疑法。不以有淨無。觀有無。本為一。已知一而除一。不於一而起想。(7-9)	審知俱空空不疑礙。亦復不見有爭無爭，有觀無觀。本無為一亦不見一。知一除一。不住於一。復不從一而起眾想。(6-9)
勤受教。善習行。因習行。入無際。習勝意。不馳心。善防識不亂轉。往來三而不著。察諸性了無根。(9-11)	等習勝意無習。有際不見有際、有勝、有負。不馳心散越內外法。善防禦識定而不轉。雖在三有不著於三。深察諸性了知無根。(9-11)
知無根不可滿。(11-12)	知無根者所謂淨地二住菩薩。(11-12)
以不滿而自整。纒觀法為同無。常住無絕無想。常無常以過上。(12-13)	自整其心觀諸法本悉同無常。常無所入不見出生。(12-13)

不念人，不宥世，不著物，罷捨求，法合離了無見。身生歿皆由化。上中下知法等。於是世往後世。觀二因如虛空。心無欲而常仁。行清白善誘人。知人向為反濁。於反濁而清澄。心遠愛筋入火。以淨火燒眾垢。已盡垢寂然淨。(13-18)	---
不念善，不念惡，不惟好，不惟醜，不念苦。不念樂。於毀譽無歡怒。(18-20)	無善不善好惡之名利衰毀譽稱譏苦樂。(13-14)
心調淨所在入。開大藏，入大法。(20-21)	調正心意無有憂惑)在所入處開示大藏，入大法海(14-15)
以道律護滿法。苦習審勤承行。以盡道為光曜。視一切性識起。流結冥意思止。勤求止以入道。剪三愛。除四失。增四城。離五覆。絕六慢。修六敬。具六法證。行七慧。強八力。拔九結。習九滅。十弘淨為已能。十力慧已備足。十直法不復學。慧法種而常存。於三寶已能備。以法施無極盡。於諸專能備行。入無所著。入空無懈。卻無吾念。無我想。無人計。無籌算。寂如滅度。(21-29)	念求七慧。煎熬三愛善制四流。修六重法成果證行。(15-17)
	如是最勝。菩薩大士具諸法已。知無形貌而不可見。是謂習學淨於二地。(17-18)

Examining both the similarities and the differences between these two texts, once again we can see that Zhu Fonian is not merely borrowing but is also modifying the borrowed material in various ways, including rearranging the characters in a different order. In stylistic terms, where the *Chengju guangming jing* favors the use of three-character segments Zhu Fonian has expanded them to four; thus 住四止 has been changed to 住四意止, 立四信 to 堅立四信, and so on. As in the case of his borrowings from Mokṣala's text, we see Zhu Fonian re-weaving the borrowed elements to accord with his own literary style.

This is not the only passage in which the *Shizhu duanjie jing* exhibits parallels with this text, for in the discussion of the fourth bodhisattva stage, Zhu Fonian's work contains yet another parallel to the *Chengju guangming jing*. Here the correspondence is even closer than what we have seen above, for the two passages match virtually word-for-word:

T630: 正立於無上獨尊之行。終不轉動捨就小道。(15.455c14-15)

He stands firmly in the unsurpassed and uniquely respectable practice; he never turns aside from it, nor does he give it up and go toward the "small Way" (*hīnayāna*).

T309: 正立無上獨尊之行。終不動轉捨就小道。(10.972a4-5)



So similar is the wording here that it is not necessary to offer a separate translation for Zhu Fonian's version, which differs only in lacking the particle 於 (presumably omitted *metri causa*) and in the reversed characters of the expression 動轉 (where T630 has 轉動).<sup>31</sup>

As it happens, the passage cited above not only reflects the (nearly) exact wording of the *Chengju guangming jing*, but it also includes one of a number of highly idiosyncratic terms that occur in the latter text: the expression *wushang duzun* 無上獨尊, an abbreviation of *wushang duzun pingdeng zhi yi* 無上獨尊平等之意, apparently used there in a way that would correspond to *anuttarasamyaksambodhi*. This expression never occurs anywhere else in Zhu Fonian's work, but it is a "term of art" in the *Chengju guangming jing*, occurring four times (in both abbreviated and longer forms) at various points in that text. (Indeed, it was the occurrence of this term in T309 that first led me to examine the relationship between Zhu Fonian's text and the *Chengju guangming jing*.) Thus in borrowing these lines from the latter text Zhu Fonian inadvertently took over one of its key technical terms, which serves as an obvious fingerprint pointing to its source.<sup>32</sup>

If we examine the broader context of the passage cited above, we can now discern additional material borrowed by Zhu Fonian from T630. In some cases he has copied his source word-for-word, while in others he has introduced variations of his own:

Zhi Yao's <i>Chengju guangming jing</i> (T630)	Zhu Fonian's <i>Shizhu duan jie jing</i> (T309)
於是五百賢士聞所受決欣悅踊躍。則得五無轉心。(15.455c11-12)	---
---	佛復告最勝: "生貴菩薩終不信邪顛倒之法。(10.972a1-3)
一者祠祀求福心不轉為。(12-13)	若見眾生各有所奉。祠祀求福心不動轉。(3-4)
二者一切五味可否。皆是眾生之神命。終不轉為害生可口。(13-14)	以食向口見有生類。(4)
三者正立於無上獨尊之行。終不轉動捨就小道。(14-15)	正立無上獨尊之行。終不動轉捨就小道。(4-5)
四者知是法尊無有與等者。勤心修持。雖有他法雜異之虛而已。法心觀別終不轉為。(15-17)	知是深法無與等者。勤心進業亦無他想。雖有他法雜異之儀。常以法性觀了別知。雖共周旋意終不轉就於他道。(5-8)
五者正使世有佛。無佛。法興。法衰。有終。有絕。(17-18)	正使遭世有佛出世及般涅槃。遺法教授復遇滅盡。聖眾遊化又值中斷。(8-9)
心在定意。不以無此三寶故轉為邪業。(18-19)	心常一定亦不變改。雖無三寶不隨邪念。(10)
是為五無轉心。(19)	---

<sup>31</sup> This provides an interesting example of one of the many "reversible binomes" found in early Chinese translations (on this topic see Zürcher 1977, p. 180).

<sup>32</sup> The abbreviated form 無上獨尊 occurs in two other texts in the Taishō canon: an early (but probably post-Han) version of the *Pratyutpannabuddhasammukhāvasthita-sūtra* (T419, 拔陂菩薩經), and a version of the *Vīradatta-grhapati-paripṛcchā*, var. *Trisaṃvaranirdeśa* (T330, 菩薩修行經). What this may indicate about the intertextual relationships among these scriptures would be worth investigating.

Once again we can see that Zhu Fonian has ignored the original context of this material, treating it instead as part of a discourse by the Buddha to the bodhisattva Most Victorious.

In earlier versions of this paper I had noted only the two passages presented above: that is, material from the *Chengju guangming jing* paralleling portions of the sections on the second and fourth stages of the bodhisattva path in Zhu Fonian's text. Three additional parallels, however—this time corresponding to materials from Zhu Fonian's sections on the third and sixth stages—have recently been located by Pu Chengzhong.<sup>33</sup> Since Pu has provided the Chinese text of these passages in his paper I have not duplicated his findings here.

What we see with the *Chengju guangming jing*, in sum, is comparable to the case of Mokṣala's *Guang zang jing*, for Zhu Fonian has again incorporated long sequences of words found in an existing translation. At the same time, however, he has altered the style of his predecessor to conform to his own literary preferences, while rearranging this borrowed material to fit within a narrative frame of his own.

### Sources of the *Shizhu duanjie jing* (3): Dharmarakṣa's *Achamo pusa jing* 阿差末菩薩經 (T403)

Parallels to Zhu Fonian's *Shizhu duanjie jing* have recently been identified in yet another text—a version of the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* translated by Dharmarakṣa—by Pu Chengzhong.<sup>34</sup> In his discussion Pu refers to these parallels as “shared doctrinal points,” and though he notes that they are expressed “in recognizably similar phrases,” he does not pursue the implications of these similarities in detail. As we shall see, however, this is clearly another case in which Zhu Fonian borrowed material from a pre-existing translation, and both the extent of the borrowing and the similarities in wording are the most sweeping of any of the sources discussed thus far.

Because of the large quantity of material that Zhu Fonian has taken over from the *Achamo pusa jing* I have not treated each of the borrowed passages separately, but instead have combined those identified thus far (seven passages in all) into a single table. The first two passages given below are not mentioned by Pu; for the remainder I have followed the indications given in his work.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>33</sup> See Pu 2008, pp. 48-29. The parallels given by Pu are the following (I have added line numbers to his references, which also indicate where he has elided certain portions of T630 in his comparative charts): passage #1, T630, 454b7-8, b10-c2, and c11-12, corresponding to T309, 969c2-18 (third stage); passage #2, T630, 455a24-b3, corresponding to T309, 970c17-22 (also from the section on the third stage); and passage #3, T630, 457a13, 14, 15, and 17-24, corresponding to T309, 976b5-11 (sixth stage).

<sup>34</sup> See Pu 2008, p. 43 and n. 65. For reasons that are not clear to me, Pu refers to the *Achamo pusa jing* as an “anonymous” translation. The attribution of a text by this title to Dharmarakṣa is found already in Sengyou's *Chu sanzang ji ji* (T2145, 55.8c7), and Pu does not offer any reasons for his doubts. It is true that the number of fascicles given in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* is different from that found in the present version of the text (four according to Sengyou vs. seven in the printed Taishō edition), and Sengyou states that he drew this reference not from Daoan but from another catalogue. The variation in fascicle numbers, however (including figures of four, five, and seven), is mentioned already in the *Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 compiled by Daoxuan 道宣 in 664 CE (T2149, 55.233a5). A cursory examination of the vocabulary and style of the *Achamo pusa jing* does not reveal anything that would be out of place in Dharmarakṣa's corpus, though further research on this topic would be welcome.

<sup>35</sup> Since Pu provides only page and register numbers, and not the specific line numbers of these

Dharmarakṣa's <i>Achamo pusa jing</i> (T403)	Zhu Fonian's <i>Shizhu duanjie jing</i> (T309)
passage #1:	
何謂專精？其意坦然常念一切。無所依者令得其依。(588b24-25)	專精其心無有流馳常念一切無所依者。為設方便令得其依。(971b18-19)
若有聞冥使睹道明。無所歸者悉受其歸。(25-26)	有聞冥者使睹大明。無所歸者為受其歸。(19-20)
其無善友為之善厚。其諛諂者令修質朴。(26-27)	處卑賤中與作善友。行姦偽者教修質朴。(20-21)
見其顯顯示忍辱柔軟和雅。(27-28)	見強梁者為是忍辱。(21-22)
所以者何？以德化故在講說中而為列露真正之義。(28-29)	---
於校飾中不為綺大。在無反復行報恩德。在眾惡處而修善行。(b29-c1)	於飾好中不為綺雅。見無反復教使報恩。處在天宮令行十善。(22-23)
在廢退處奉修德祚。在欺慢處常行恭恪。(2)	---
在貢高處不懷自大。(2-3)	設見貢高不懷自大。(24)
在求便處無能得短。(3)	有求其便不能得短(24-25)
不念人惡不宣缺漏。(3-4)	不思念惡不說缺漏。(25)
若在不正輒往將護使入正(c5)諦。一切眾生皆來到所。(4-5)	若在邪業輒往[←住]將護使入安諦。眾生之類來到其所。(25-26)
見之欣然無瞋恚心。(5)	歡喜承受無瞋恚心。(26-27)
其有諫喻示進退宜當然不然。心無增減。(6)	有諫喻者示進退法。此當應爾此不應爾。可然不然心無增減。(27-28)
篤信禍福所作歸身。(7)	篤信罪福知有報對。設在城郭遊近人間。(28-29)
若在曠野山居巖處如法無異。不貪利害不惜身命。(7-8)	如在曠野巖居不異。不貪利業不惜身命。(b29-c1)
心淨之故初不增減。常護其口不忘傳語。(8-9)	心懷清淨無是非意。常護口過言無彼此。(1-2)
不求奉敬。所以者何？恒知節限止足而已。(9-10)	不求供養望其奉敬。明知節限止足而已。(2-3)
其心柔和不隨弊惡失禮義者。有功德故。度於生死息眾苦患。(10-12)	心常柔和不由弊惡。度於生死息諸患苦。(3-4)
所以者何？由是之故菩薩慧意永不可盡。(12)	由是永致成大乘跡菩薩慧心亦不可見。(4-5)

correspondences, it is not possible to determine whether the passages I have given here start and stop at precisely the same points as his. The correspondences between the table given here are the references provided by Pu are as follows: passage #3: Pu T403, 13.589b [sic] and T309, 10.971c-972a; #4: Pu 13.596b and 10.973a; #5: 13.576b-c [sic] and 10.1001c; #6a: Pu 13.596c and 10.975a; #6b: Pu 13.596c and 10.1004b-c; and #7: Pu 13.597a and 10.975b. I have not been able to locate the parallels intended by Pu in the final set of page numbers listed in his note (13.597b and 10.979a).

生死往反亦不可盡。以權方便。明了隨時訓誨眾生迷於終始。(13-14)	生死往返亦無所有。以權方便明了訓誨。隨時適化斷於終始。(5-6)
passage #2:	
後世所生常得餽饌。若不甘者入口即美。(589a5-6)	身體香潔莫不悅豫。常得餽饌甘美之味。(971c18-19)
宿之所殖而得是相。其無手巾因施與之。後世所生清淨無垢。為人所護。(6-8)	宿福所殖而致奇相。清淨無垢為人所護。(19-20)
其無護者為之將護。猶若屋室。所以喻室覆蓋人故。(8-9)	---
隨其所乏而施與之。(9)	隨其所乏而施與之。(20-21)
後世所生悉獲所當尋得周給病與醫藥。(10)	---
後世所生身常無病不生不死。無有眾患恒獲安隱。一切備足靡所不主。(10-12)	身常無病不生不死無有眾患。恒獲安隱一切具足。(21-22)
其無僕使給與奴婢。後世所生自然具足。萬乘帝主制上御下無所乏少。其求眾寶則能與之。(12-15)	---
後世所生備悉成就三十有二大人之相。(14-15)	備悉成就三十有二大人之相。(22-23)
布施雜物若干種品。(15-16)	---
後世所生得八十種眾好之姿。(16)	得八十種眾好之容。(23)
passage #3:	
未曾貪吝後逮法藏。充備道慧無所匱乏。(589a20-21)	敷開法藏不生貪欲。充備道慧無所匱乏。(971c23-24)
菩薩設得為轉輪王主四天下。七寶盈滿。(21-22)	---
若有來求而不愛惜輒能盡施。後所生處逮一切智。(22-23)	有來求索而不愛惜。輒能盡施逮一切智。(24-25)
諸通聖慧廣濟一切。以妙伎樂而施與者。後得經典樂以法樂莫不歡然。(24-25)	諸通聖慧廣濟無窮。得深經典樂法之樂。(25-26)
若為勢位有忠羽翼行菩薩法。猶如王者之忠臣。有人來求以自輔政即能與之。(25-27)	---
由是之故後佛法教欲坐道場。於佛樹下降伏魔兵。(27-28)	於佛樹下坐于道場。降伏魔兵及諸官屬。(26-27)
以手施人。(28)	不以色故有所施為。(27)
---	知色為空色亦自空。色不自知乃知色空。如是最勝。菩薩解知色性空者。(27-29)
後為一切道法之首。(28-29)	便為一切道法之首。(29)
耳鼻施者。後身具足無一缺漏。以眼施者。(a29-b1)	---
後逮法眼為一切首道法之眼。(1)	成就法眼為一切道。(972a1)

以頭施者。後所生處。(1-2)	---
<u>三世特尊</u> 。 <u>獨步無侶諸通敏慧</u> 。(2-3)	<u>三世特尊獨步無侶</u> 。斯由具足 <u>諸通慧</u> 故。(1-2)
<b>passage #4:</b>	
有十六事不與慧合。何謂十六？(596b 6-7)	---
用無明故而起 <u>陰陽</u> 。從生 <u>老死</u> 皆不與慧同。 <u>諸所作為亦不同塵</u> 。 <u>亦復不與六十二見而雜錯也</u> 。(7-9)	斷除無明消滅五陰。息 <u>老病死</u> 諸所作為。 <u>不與塵勞亦復不與六十二見而共和同</u> 。(973a15-17)
<u>不自貢高亦不卑己</u> 。有利無利若譽若謗。若稱失名若苦若樂。(9-10)	<u>不自稱譽亦不自卑</u> 。(17-18)
<u>過世八事貢高自大謙卑恭慎</u> 。俗間有是二十一事。不與合同。 <u>去累煩惱不為愚冥</u> 。(10-12)	<u>過世八事無有高下</u> 。常知 <u>恭順去諸苦惱</u> 。(18-19)
<u>覺寤睡眠脫諸恐懼</u> 。 <u>不與罪合及諸心垢</u> 。(12-13)	不行癡冥覺寤睡眠。度諸恐懼不與罪俱及諸心垢斷。(19-20)
不除五陰故至生死。 <u>身魔、罪魔、死魔、天魔</u> 而共合也。(13-15)	於五陰乃至生死身魔、罪魔、死魔、天魔思惟抑制不造彼緣。(20-21)
<b>passage #5:</b>	
識分別一切羅漢及緣覺。至菩薩演諸法。何謂曉五陰。諸所生滅猶如幻化。(596b26-28)	羅漢緣覺所不能了。 <u>菩薩</u> 覺知法性所覺。 <u>如幻如化熱時之炎</u> 。(1001c14-15)
<u>夢中所見芭蕉野馬山中之響鏡中之像水中泡沫</u> 。(28-29)	<u>芭蕉野馬呼聲之響</u> 。 <u>鏡像水月泡沫夢現</u> 。(16)
<b>passage #6a:</b>	
如解言曰。其眼亦空而無吾我。亦不無我是亦悉空。所以者何。(596c19-21)	如是最勝。修成大士復觀眼空而無吾我。非不有我我及無我是亦悉空。(975a14-16)
<u>解我空者在於諸衰而不為衰</u> 。是則名曰解於六衰。 <u>諦計六衰不著不斷</u> 。(21-22)	<u>解我空者。在諸衰入不見端緒</u> 。 <u>諦計六衰不著不斷</u> 。(16-17)
是為菩薩解於六衰。 <u>眼色為衰所視不墮</u> 。(22-23)	是謂菩薩於六衰法而無起滅。 <u>眼色為衰眾亂之首</u> 。(17-18)
<b>passage #6b:</b>	
是為菩薩解於六衰。 <u>眼色為衰所視不墮</u> 。所以者何？ <u>不中道取證</u> 。 <u>耳鼻口身意亦悉如是</u> 。(22-24)	解於空者乃為法界。 <u>菩薩</u> 大士復當思惟解於六衰。 <u>眼之視色色亦無有</u> 。前物入色亦復無有。 <u>耳鼻口身意亦復如是</u> 。本無為一而無有二。亦知道證而無有證。不見受證不見不受證。(b28-c6)
<b>passage #7:</b>	
阿差末菩薩曰：“ <u>其諦有一無有二也</u> 。所以者何？(597a7-8)	菩薩聖諦其實 <u>有一而無有二</u> 。(975b12-13)

如來至真無所希望。亦不想求色與無色。無所希望這得其中。是別四諦。復有五陰苦者是惱之相。好解空者。是曰苦諦。(9-11)

無著至真無所希望。亦不想求色亦不想求無色。於想無想平等無二。是則名曰真諦之相。已獲審諦。如實諦相者。便能曉了五陰之相。五陰所生苦毒之相。(13-16)

Once again we see Zhu Fonian not simply borrowing from his source text word-for-word, but weaving the borrowed material into his own composition. In a larger number of instances than before, however, he has taken over substantial segments without changing a single character. One reason for this, no doubt, is that Dharmarakṣa (at least in this instance) used a regular four-character prosodic style throughout. Thus Zhu Fonian did not have to make major stylistic changes when integrating Dharmarakṣa's material into his own composition.

Yet Zhu Fonian has occasionally adopted wording that is foreign to his usual style. In referring to the thirty-two marks (*lakṣaṇa*) of the Buddha, for example, Zhu Fonian gives this number as 三十有二. But this form of the number (with the character 有 intervening between “thirty” and “two”) does not occur anywhere else in his corpus. On the contrary, in Dharmarakṣa's work this rather archaic rendering occurs more than a dozen times. Once again the use of an expression that is atypical of his work points directly to the fact that Zhu Fonian has taken it over in the course of borrowing from an existing translation.

As noted above, my own examination of the content of the *Achamo pusa jing* netted two parallels to Zhu Fonian's work in addition to those given by Pu, and it seems likely that further parallels with the *Shizhu duanjie jing* still remain to be identified. What is already clear at this stage, however, is that Zhu Fonian drew heavily on Dharmarakṣa's text in the production of his own.

### **Zhu Fonian at work: The formation of the *Shizhu duanjie jing***

Above we have examined three cases in which Zhu Fonian's *Shizhu duanjie jing* borrows extensively from earlier Chinese texts. In some cases the borrowed material is quoted word-for-word, while in others it has been reworked to conform to Zhu Fonian's preferred four-character style. Zhu Fonian has also added material not found in his source-texts; conversely, he has eliminated portions of these texts (notably their narrative frameworks, which give the names of the interlocutors, the setting, and the reason for the discourse) while replacing them with a story line of his own. What we have here, in sum, is far more complex than ordinary plagiarism, but might instead be called “creative appropriation,” with Zhu Fonian drawing substantial material from existing Chinese scriptures while at the same time reframing and rearranging it within a genuinely new composition.

The passages examined above demonstrate clearly the way in which Zhu Fonian went about his work, and such a procedure is impossible to harmonize with any conceivable scenario of “translation” from an Indian text. And it is highly unlikely that these are the only examples of borrowed material in the *Shizhu duanjie jing*. On the contrary, a thorough examination of the entire work—which, we should recall, totals more than eighty Taishō

pages—would surely yield many more such cases.<sup>36</sup>

Bearing this in mind, in future studies it will also be important to examine portions of the *Shizhu duanjie jing* that do not seem to have parallels in earlier texts—that is, those that were presumably composed by Zhu Fonian without direct reference to other scriptures. A good example can be found in the opening lines of the text, where we can now see several things that appear to be anomalous. For example, the Buddha is said to be accompanied by “84,000 bhikṣus and 104,000 bodhisattvas” (與大比丘眾八萬四千、菩薩十萬四千人俱). 84,000 is of course a standard Buddhist number, but 104,000 is not; it appears that, knowing that the number of bodhisattvas should be greater than that of the bhikṣus, the portion of the Chinese number signifying “80,000” (八萬) was simply increased to “100,000” (十萬) while leaving the portion meaning “4,000” (四千) unchanged, thus yielding a number that does not—to the best of my knowledge—appear in any genuine Indian text. The expression “Dark Mirror” (玄鑑) is also unexpected, and I have not been able to find any occurrence of this expression in any translated text. The list of names of the gods in attendance is also non-standard, beginning with a category of “earth lord[s]” (地主) which would not be expected in this context.<sup>37</sup> The gods of the fifth heaven, Nirmāṇarati, are omitted from the list, while those of the sixth, those of the Paranirmitavaśavartin realm, seem to be mentioned twice (both as 化自在天 and as 他化自在天). Such oddities can be found here and there throughout the text, and they may provide additional evidence that in producing the *Shizhu duanjie jing* Zhu Fonian was working “within Chinese” rather than translating directly from an Indian original.

While computer searches focused on terminology can identify parallel wording found in disparate texts, the identification of similar themes (expressed in different wording) requires investigation of another kind. An incident already discussed above—the bodhisattva Controlled Intention’s request to visit the Sahā world, and the Buddha Distinguished Victory’s instructions to him on how to conduct himself when he does—evokes a similar scene in the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, suggesting that Zhu Fonian may have been drawing upon Zhi Qian’s earlier translation of this text (see above, pp. 236-237). A close reading of the *Shizhu duanjie jing* together with various Buddhist scriptures popular in Zhu Fonian’s time may help to identify other sources from which he borrowed not the exact words, but a variety of literary tropes, doctrinal elements, and narrative motifs.

### Authoring an Apocryphon: In Search of a Motive

The evidence presented above places the *Shizhu duanjie jing* squarely within the category of texts generally referred to in English as “apocrypha”—that is, “false” or inauthentic scriptures purporting to be the word of the Buddha but actually composed in China (Ch. *weijing* 偽經, Jpn. *gikyō* 偽經). The term “apocryphon” has come under attack in recent

<sup>36</sup> Just as this paper was going to press, Stefano Zacchetti drew my attention to a parallel between the *Shizhu duanjie jing* and another translation by Dharmarakṣa, the *Chixin fantian suowen jing* 持心梵天所問經; see T585, 15.2a6-17 and T309, 10.966b1-15.

<sup>37</sup> It is possible that Zhu Fonian intended this as a reference to ordinary (i.e., human) kings, but in the context it appears to be the first in a list of types of *devas*.

decades (with some scholars lobbying for a more neutral term, such as “indigenous scriptures”), and indeed it is important to point out that texts credited to the Buddha but composed long after his death (whether in China or elsewhere) can come into being in a variety of ways.<sup>38</sup> Yet in the present case the pattern of correspondences between Zhu Fonian’s work and scriptures translated into Chinese before his time leaves us no alternative but to view the the *Shizhu duanjie jing* as a deliberately created forgery. But if it is true that Zhu Fonian composed the work himself but presented it as a translation of an Indian text, then what could his motive have been? As a monk renowned for his linguistic abilities, who had been feted at court for his accomplishments in translating two large *āgama* collections as well as other texts, why would he subsequently have stooped to such a reprehensible (and, one would think, rather risky) activity?

Here again Sengyou’s biographical account may contain valuable clues, for as noted above, he portrays Zhu Fonian’s output as falling into two distinct stages: an early stage (during the reign of Fu Jian of the Former Qin) when Zhu Fonian was invited to take part in a state-sponsored translation project, working closely with a number of foreign monks, followed by an interim period (c. 387-399) for which Sengyou passes over his activities, if any, in silence; and a second stage (encompassing some portion of the years 399-415, during the reign of Yao Xing of the Latter Qin) when Zhu Fonian produced texts “one after another,” with no mention of any foreign monks taking part. It is to this second stage of textual production, according to Sengyou’s biographical description, that the *Shizhu duanjie jing* belongs, together with several other voluminous scriptures. The picture that emerges is of Zhu Fonian working alone in his study, churning out one mammoth text after another without assistance—or perhaps more to the point, without interference—from any Indian or Central Asian informant.

Stepping back to view Zhu Fonian’s situation within its historical context, we can quickly see that his first period of translation activity began during the period of generous patronage of Buddhism by the Former Qin ruler Fu Jian, and that it came to a close not long after the latter’s death in 385 CE. In the following years, as other members of the Fu family ruled in rapid succession until the dynasty was finally conquered by the Latter Qin in 394, Sengyou says nothing about further patronage, nor does he refer to any works by Zhu Fonian. It was only during the reign of Yao Xing of the Latter Qin (and more specifically, during or after the year 399 CE) that Zhu Fonian’s work appears to have commenced once again.

But though Yao Xing took up Fu Jian’s role as a patron of Buddhism, he did not follow his predecessor in paying special attention to Zhu Fonian. Instead, he is best known for his successful efforts to bring Kumārajīva to Chang’an and the subsequent sponsorship of his vast translation enterprise, as well as for his great admiration for the Chinese monk Huiyuan 慧遠. The impression one gets, in sum, is that royal attention had now shifted from Zhu

---

<sup>38</sup> Mahāyāna sūtras produced in India—all of which date from well after the Buddha’s time, and thus in the strict sense are also “apocryphal”—contain evidence for several different scenarios of composition, including discourses heard in visions or dreams, the expansion of a canonical scripture via commentary, and the gradual “sūtrafication” of a popular sermon (originally without any claim to be *buddhavacana*). Thus to assume that all apocryphal texts, whether produced in China or elsewhere, are the result of deliberate forgery would be reductionist in the extreme.



Fonian to Kumārajīva, under whose leadership the translation of Mahāyāna scriptures became the primary focus of concern.

It is precisely at this time—that is, several years after the accession of Yao Xing—that we find Zhu Fonian beginning to produce his latter works, a series of unusual scriptures almost all of which (unlike his earlier work) are in the form of Mahāyāna sūtras. Above we have noted that, with the partial exception of his expanded *Dharmapada*, all of the texts assigned by Sengyou to this latter period are without parallels in any other language. And a likely reason for this is now easy to see: there are no counterparts of these texts in other Buddhist canons, and no earlier or later Chinese translations of them, for the simple reason that Zhu Fonian composed them himself.

Given this overall historical setting, a motive for Zhu Fonian's unorthodox activity also begins to come into view. Having once enjoyed royal support, but now being completely overshadowed by the new ruler's focus on bringing Kumārajīva to the capital and subsequently sponsoring his work, Zhu Fonian may have begun to produce new "scriptures" without benefit of any Indian source-texts in an attempt to revive his own flagging fame.

Seen from this perspective, a passage found in another text from Zhu Fonian's second period of textual production, the *Pusa chu tai jing* 菩薩處胎經 (T384), becomes quite revealing. Sengyou's high regard for Zhu Fonian was demonstrated not only in his biographical section but even in his introduction to the catalogue as a whole, where Zhu Fonian's *Pusa chu tai jing* is one of only three scriptures that Sengyou quotes in describing how the Buddhist canon was formed. The other two—Kumarajīva's *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論 (T1509) and his translation of the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* (*Shisong lü* 十誦律, T1435)—were both prestigious texts, and for Zhu Fonian's sutra to be included in this company constitutes high praise indeed.

The passage cited by Sengyou is quite peculiar, however, for it contains a list of eight divisions of the canon that is not found in any other source. The passage reads as follows:

爾時阿難最初出經。胎化藏為第一。中陰藏第二。摩訶衍方等藏第三。戒律藏第四。十住菩薩藏第五。雜藏第六。金剛藏第七。佛藏第八。是為釋迦文佛經法具足矣(T2145, 55.4a26-29; cf. T384, 12.1058b19-23)

At the time when Ānanda first recited (出) the scriptures, the Womb Conversion treasury (胎化藏) was first; the Antarābhava treasury (中陰藏) was second, the treasury containing the extensive scriptures of the Mahāyāna (摩訶衍方等藏) was third, the Vinaya treasury (戒律藏) was fourth, the Ten-stages bodhisattva treasury (十住菩薩藏) was fifth, the Miscellaneous treasury (雜藏) was sixth, the Vajra treasury (金剛藏) was seventh, and the Buddha treasury (佛藏) was eighth. This is the complete [collection] of Śākyamuni Buddha's Dharma (經法).

It is striking that several of these so-called "treasuries" echo the names of texts produced by Zhu Fonian himself, beginning with the "Womb Conversion treasury" which evokes the title

of the very text in which this passage appears.<sup>39</sup> Likewise the “Antarābhava treasury” (cf. the *Zhongyin jing* 中陰經, T385) and the “Ten-stages bodhisattva treasury” (cf. the *Shiju duanjie jing* 十住斷結經, T309) are easy to associate with other works produced during Zhu Fonian’s second period of textual activity. Rather than being an account of an unusual canonical arrangement known in India, it now seems likely that this list was invented by Zhu Fonian, deliberately highlighting the works that he himself had produced. In so doing, however, he left a clear mark of his own activity, like the fingerprints of a criminal at the scene of the crime.

Whether Zhu Fonian’s literary productions succeeded in re-establishing his prominence during his own lifetime is unclear, but it is evident that within a century—that is, by the time Sengyou produced the *Chu sanzang ji ji*—his reputation as one of the great figures in Chinese translation history was firmly in place. With Sengyou giving Zhu Fonian’s work a ringing endorsement, the latter’s reputation was secure, and modern scholars have generally followed suit. To cite only a single example, Erik Zürcher proclaimed Zhu Fonian to be “one of the great early translators, a worthy precursor of Kumārajīva” (2007, p. 202).

It is ironic that Sengyou held this opinion, however, given that one of his main concerns in compiling the *Chu sanzang ji ji* was to identify and expunge apocryphal works. Yet—in the absence of the research tools that are available to us today—Zhu Fonian’s activity as a forger of texts escaped his eye. Far from being suspicious of Zhu Fonian’s work, Sengyou drew upon it with enthusiasm, placing what we can now see to be a clearly apocryphal list of “eight *piṭakas*” near the beginning of his own monumental work.

### Re-evaluating Zhu Fonian’s Corpus: Conclusions and Desiderata

Above I have presented numerous examples of passages in which the *Shizhu duanjie jing* incorporates material drawn from pre-existing Chinese Buddhist translations. These examples point to the unavoidable conclusion that at least part—and most likely all—of the *Shizhu duanjie jing* is not a translation, but a forgery. We are thus in the highly unusual situation of being able not only to recognize the text as an apocryphon, but knowing the name of the author as well. Weaving passages from translated scriptures together with his own creative work, Zhu Fonian has produced a “sūtra” which is neither wholly invented nor wholly borrowed, but is rather a pastiche, combining existing Chinese material with a narrative of his own. An obvious corollary of this finding is that the *Shizhu duanjie jing* cannot be used as evidence for Buddhism in India, but tells us instead about two quite different things: about certain Buddhist texts circulating in China at the beginning of the fifth century (as seen in the borrowed portions), and (in the parts that were his own new creations) about ideas and images of interest to Zhu Fonian himself.

Other parts of the discussion above should be regarded, at this stage, as hypothetical. I have chosen to use Sengyou’s biography of Zhu Fonian as an interpretive frame of reference, and it points toward an understandable chronology of his work as well as a possible motive

<sup>39</sup> The phrase “womb conversion” (胎化) does not occur in the title itself, but it appears thirteen times within the sūtra, including two places in chapter thirty-five where the text refers to itself as “this Womb Conversion scripture” (此胎化經典; see 12.1057b15 and 20).

for his decision to forge new Buddhist texts. But, as mentioned briefly above, the chronology given in the biographical section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* does not always tally with what is seen in the catalogue portion of the same text. Indeed, the situation can only be described as chaotic, with discrepancies in dating (at least in Zhu Fonian's case) at almost every turn.<sup>40</sup> A thorough examination of all of the chronological information found in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* concerning Zhu Fonian's career—whether in his own biography or those of his associates, in the catalogue listings themselves, or in prefaces to his work—is urgently needed. Such a study may well reveal more about the formation of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* itself (a work which is anything but homogeneous) than about the actual dates of Zhu Fonian's output, but it is highly desirable nonetheless. Following Palumbo's findings (see above, p. 232) I believe that there is good reason to prioritize the chronology found in Zhu Fonian's biography, but further work on all aspects of this problem would be most welcome.

Other desiderata for future studies also emerge in light of the analysis given above. Having seen clear evidence that the *Shizhu duanjie jing* is an apocryphon composed by Zhu Fonian, it now seems reasonable to raise the question of authenticity with respect to other texts that he produced as well. An obvious place to begin is with those texts assigned by Sengyou to Zhu Fonian's later period, none of which (as we have seen) have counterparts in any other language. Scholars have long suspected that at least two of these—the *Pusa chu tai jing* 菩薩處胎經 (T384) and the *Zhongyin jing* 中陰經 (T385)—might be apocryphal, but to my knowledge this possibility has not yet been studied systematically. In her study of the *Pusa chu tai jing* Elsa Legittimo has argued that the text is not apocryphal, but is a genuine translation of an Indian scripture (perhaps with minor interpolations introduced by Zhu Fonian).<sup>41</sup> Elsewhere, however, she has pointed out that certain sections of the text seem to draw their inspiration from the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* and the *Lotus Sūtra* (*Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra*).<sup>42</sup> Legittimo's hypothesis is that these similarities are the result of borrowing from these two scriptures by the author(s) of the Indian source-text of the *Pusa chu tai jing*. But we can now see that there is another (and surely more likely) possibility as well. The *Vimalakīrti* and the *Lotus* were already available in Zhu Fonian's time in Chinese translations (produced by Zhi Qian and Dharmarakṣa, respectively), and they had become so popular that they were translated by Kumārajīva once again. It may be worth revisiting these sections to see whether they reflect not only the content of the *Vimalakīrti* and the *Lotus* in general, but perhaps also the precise wording of these earlier Chinese texts.

But it is not only the Mahāyāna works produced during the latter part of Zhu Fonian's career, but also the non-Mahāyāna works produced throughout his lifetime, that may bear re-examination in light of what we have seen. In a recent study HIRAOKA Satoshi has shown that Zhu Fonian's version of the *Dharmapada* appears to contain apocryphal material

<sup>40</sup> For example, in Sengyou's biography of Zhu Fonian the *Chuyao jing* 出曜經 (T212) is said to have been produced, as noted above, during the the Hongshi 弘始 period (399-415), under the rule of Yao Xing 姚興 of the Latter Qin 後秦 (T2145, 55.111b21-22). According to the catalogue section of the same work, however, it was produced during the Xiaowu 孝武 period (372-396 CE) of the Jin 晉 dynasty, during the time of Fu Jian (r. 357-384 CE; see 55.10c5-6: 晉孝武時涼州沙門竺佛念以符堅時於關中譯出).

<sup>41</sup> Legittimo 2006, pp. 427-428.

<sup>42</sup> See Legittimo 2007 (on the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*) and 2008 (on the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra*).

(Hiraoka 2007a). Studies by the same author have shown that the extant version of the *Ekottarikāgama* (T125) is a “patchwork,” exhibiting materials drawn from more than one Indian school (Hiraoka 2007b and 2008). It may now be worth raising the question of whether these anomalies stem not from cross-lineage contamination in India, but from Zhu Fonian’s own intervention in the course of the translation process. Thus while the most likely candidates for being purely apocryphal are those texts produced during the latter part of Zhu Fonian’s life, we should now be alert to the possibility of “apocryphal interpolations” in his earlier translations as well.

It could even be the case that a text credited to Zhu Fonian but long known to be apocryphal, the *Pusa yingluo benye jing* 菩薩瓔珞本業經 (T1485), might turn out to be his work as well. Based on the evidence presented above, it is entirely possible that future research may show this text to be both an apocryphon (i.e., a Chinese composition) and the work of Zhu Fonian, who now appears not only as a translator but as a master composer of new Buddhist texts.

## Bibliography

- Demiéville, Paul, 1954. “Le Yogācārabhūmi de Saṅgharakṣa.” *Bulletin de l’École française d’Extrême-Orient*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 339-436.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Hubert Durt, and Anna Seidel, eds., 1978. *Répertoire du canon bouddhique sino-japonais, Édition de Taishō (Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō)*. Fascicule annexe du Hōbōgirin 法寶義林. 2nd revised edition. Paris: L’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres, Institut de France.
- ENOMOTO Fumio 榎本文雄, 1994. “A Note on Kashmir as Referred to in Chinese Literature: Ji-bin.” In IKARI Yasuke 井狩彌介, ed., *A Study on the Nīlamata: Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir* (Kyoto: Kyoto University, Institute for Research in Humanities), pp. 357-365.
- Harrison, Paul, 1990. *The Samādhi of Direct Encounter with the Buddhas of the Present*. Tokyo: The International Institute of Buddhist Studies.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1998. “Women in the Pure Land: Some Reflections on the Textual Sources.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 26, pp. 553-572.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1999. “On the Authorship of the Oldest Chinese Translation of the *Larger Sukhāvativyūhasūtra*.” Unpublished paper presented at the International Association of Buddhist Studies meeting, Lausanne, Switzerland.
- Harrison, Paul, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, and Kazunobu MATSUDA, 2002. “Larger Sukhāvativyūha.” In Jens Braarvig, ed., *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, III: Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 2 (Oslo: Hermes Publishing), pp. 179-214.
- HIRAOKA Satoshi 平岡聡, 2007a. “Shutsuyōkyō no seiritsu ni kansuru mondai” 『出曜經』の成立に関する問題 [Issues concerning the formation of the *Chuyao jing*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 55, no. 2, pp. 848-842 [sic] (horizontal section).
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2007b. “Zōichiagonkyō no seiritsu kaimei ni mukete (1)” 『増一阿含經』の成立解明に向けて (1) [The Sectarial Affiliation of the *Zengyi ahan-jing* (1)]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 56, no. 1, pp. 305-298 [sic] (horizontal section).
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2008. “Zōichiagonkyō no seiritsu kaimei ni mukete (2)” 『増一阿含經』の成立解明に向けて (2) [The Sectarial Affiliation of the *Zengyi ahan-jing* (2)]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 57, no. 1, pp. 319-312 [sic] (horizontal section).
- KARASHIMA Seishi 辛嶋静志, 1999. “Hokekyō no bunkengakuteki kenkyū (2): Kannon ‘Avalokitasvara’ no gogi kaishaku” 法華經の文献的研究 (2): 観音 ‘Avalokitasvara’ の語義解釈. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 1998* [ARIRIAB], vol. 2, pp. 39-66.
- KUWAYAMA Shōshin 桑山正通, 1990. *Kapiśi-Gandhāra-shi kenkyū* カーピシー-ガンダーラ史研究. Kyoto: Kyoto University, Institute for Research in the Humanities.
- Legittimo, Elsa I., 2006. “Analysis of the *Pusa chutai jing* 菩薩處胎經 (T12, no. 384).” Ph.D. thesis, International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies, Tokyo.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2007. “The *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*’s Narration on the *Amṛta* Distribution and its Exploitation by the *Pusa chutai jing*’s Authors.” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 1079-1084.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. "A comparative study between the *Womb* and the *Lotus sūtra*: Miraculous stūpa apparitions, two simultaneous Buddhas and related extraordinary narrations." *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 1114-1120.
- Link, Arthur E., 1957. "Remarks on Shih Seng-yu's *Ch'u San-tsang chi-chi* as a Source for Hui-chiao's *Kao-seng chuan* as Evidenced in Two Versions of the Biography of Tao-an." *Oriens* 10, pp. 292-295.
- Nattier, Jan, 2003. "The Ten Epithets of the Buddha in the Translations of Zhi Qian 支謙." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2002* [ARIRIAB], vol. 6, pp. 207-250.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. "Re-evaluating the Translations of Zhu Fonian 竺佛念: A Preliminary Report." American Oriental Society, Western Branch, Victoria, B.C., Canada, October 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007a. "'One Vehicle' (一乘) in the Chinese *Āgamas*: New Light on an Old Problem in Pāli." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2006* [ARIRIAB], vol. 10, pp. 181-200.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007b. "Avalokiteśvara in Early Chinese Buddhist Translations: A Preliminary Survey." In William Magee and Yi-hsun Huang, eds., *Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara and Modern Society: Proceedings of the Fifth Chung-Hwa International Conference on Buddhism* (Taipei: The Chung-Hwa Institute), pp. 181-212.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica, X. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008 (2009). "Who Produced the *Damingdu jing* 大明度經 (T225)? A Reassessment of the Evidence." In *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 31, nos. 1-2, pp. 295-337.
- OKAYAMA Hajime 丘山新, 1984. "Jiku Butsunen" 竺佛念. *Bukkyō bunka* 仏教文化, vol. 14, pp. 23-40.
- Palumbo, Antonello, 2003. "Dharmarakṣa and Kaṇṭhaka: White Horse Monasteries in Early Medieval China." In Giovanni Verardi and Silvio Vita, eds., *Buddhist Asia 1: Papers from the First Conference of Buddhist Studies Held in Naples in May 2001* (Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale": Centro di Studi sul Buddhismo, 2001), pp. 186-199.
- PU Chengzhong, 2008. "Notes on the *Chengju guangming jing*, 'Sūtra of Achieving the Bright Light Concentration'." *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 27-53.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G., 1991. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Schopen, Gregory, 1984. "Filial Piety and the Monk in the Practice of Indian Buddhism: A Question of 'Sinicization' Viewed from the Other Side." *T'oung Pao*, vol. 70, pp. 110-26.
- Shih, Robert, 1968. *Biographies des moines éminents (Kao seng tchouan) de Houei-kiao*. Première partie: *Biographies des premiers traducteurs*. Louvain: Institut Orientaliste.
- Taishō University, Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, 2004. *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations*. Taishō University: Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism.
- UNEBE Toshihide 飯部俊英, 1968. "Jiku Butsunen no kenkyū—Kanyaku Zōichigonkyō no yakushutsu o megutte" 竺佛念の研究—漢訳『増老阿含經』の訳出をめぐって. *Nagoya daigaku bungakubu kenkyūronshū* 名古屋大学文学部研究論集, vol. 48, pp. 3-38.
- Vetter, Tillman, and Paul Harrison, 1998. "An Shigao's Chinese Translation of the *Saptasthānasūtra*." In Paul Harrison and Gregory Schopen, eds., *Sūryacandrāya: Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, Indica et Tibetica, 35 (Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag), pp. 197-216.
- Zacchetti, Stefano, 2002. "An early Chinese translation corresponding to Chapter 6 of the *Peṭakopadesa*. An Shigao's *Yin chi ru jing* T 603 and its Indian original: a preliminary survey." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 74-98.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. *In Praise of the Light: A Critical Synoptic Edition with an Annotated Translation of Chapters 1-3 of Dharmarakṣa's Guang zan jing 光讚經. Being the Earliest Chinese Translation of the Larger Prajñāpāramitā*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica VIII. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Zürcher, Erik, 1977. "Late Han Vernacular Elements in the Earliest Buddhist Translations." *Journal of the Chinese Languages Teachers Association*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 177-203.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*. 3rd edition. Leiden: E. J. Brill.